



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/621,694	07/16/2003	Aaditya Mahajan	TRQ-12957	1499
22888	7590 01/11/2005		EXAMINER	
BEVER HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP			LEE, PATRICK J	
TRI-VALLEY OFFICE 1432 CONCANNON BLVD., BLDG. G			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	E, CA 94550		2878	
			DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/621,694	MAHAJAN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Patrick J. Lee	2878			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2003.					
	<u> </u>				
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-8,11-16 and 20-27 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 9,10,17-19 and 28-33 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0703.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2878

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Drawings**

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the InGaAs layer having a concentration greater than 53 percent must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On line 10 of paragraph [0003], there are two labels "129 121" listed.

On line 2 of paragraph [0010], "aborb" should read, "absorb".

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "wherein" should be disposed before "the InGaAs". Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how the lattice constant of the metamorphic buffer layer is to be lattice matched to the metamorphic buffer layer – this would seem to be inherent. It appears that this could be a typographical mistake.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 1-3, 11, 15-16, 20, & 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,479,032 to Forrest et al.

With respect to claims 1, 11, & 20, Forrest et al disclose a light detection system comprising a substrate layer (15), InGaAs layers (11, 13) with a sublattice indium concentration greater than 53% (see column 3, lines 1-7).

With respect to claims 2-3, 15-16, & 25-26, Forrest et al disclose a substrate (15) and layers 17, 21, 23, 25, 9) that comprise a metamorphic buffer layer having a varying composition to lattice match the substrate (15) with the absorption layers (11) (see column 3, lines 7-9).

With respect to claim 4, Forrest et al does not disclose the structure to be of a metal-semiconductor-metal photodiode.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 5-8, 12-14, 21-24, & 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,479,032 to Forrest et al.

Forrest et al discloses the device as described in the discussion of claims 1-4, 11, 15-16, 20, & 25-26.

With respect to claims 5-7, 12-14, & 21-24, Forrest et al disclose the indium concentration to be greater than 53% (see column 6, lines 62-66), but does not explicitly disclose the sublattice indium concentrations as claimed. Such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to allow for the device to function for different wavelengths of light.

With respect to claims 8 & 27, Forrest et al disclose areas (35, 37, 39), contacts (40, 44, 46), and electrical contacts (43, 45, 47), but does not explicitly disclose the use of p-type anodes and n-type cathodes. However, such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because such would allow for proper transfer of the signal detected in the absorption layer to processing and output devices.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

- 11. Claims 9-10, 17-19, & 28-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With respect to claims 9 & 17-19, Forrest et al do not disclose the use of a reflective layer, instead opting for an anti-reflection coating (42).

With respect to claims 10 & 29-33, Forrest et al do not disclose nor suggest the use of a gallium arsenide substrate.

With respect to claim 28, Forrest et al do not disclose nor suggest the use of an etch stop layer.

#### Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5,594,237 to Kulick et al disclose a PIN detector.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick J. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/621,694

Art Unit: 2878

Page 7

Patrick J. Lee Examiner Art Unit 2878

PJL January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2005

Stephone B. Allen Primary Examiner